

# Valley Center Community Planning Group

Minutes for the June 9, 2008 Regular Meeting

Chairman: Oliver Smith Vice Chairman: Susan Simpson Secretary: Deb Hoffer

7:00 pm at the Valley Center Community Hall; 28246 Lilac Road, Valley Center CA 92082

A=Absent Ab=Abstain A/I=Agenda Item BOS=Board of Supervisors DPLU=Department of Planning and Land Use IAW=In Accordance  
With N=Nay P=Present SC=Subcommittee TBD=To Be Determined VCCPG=Valley Center Community Planning Group Y=Yes

Forwarded to Members: June 16, 2008

Approved: July 14, 2008

## 1. Call to Order and Roll Call by Seat #:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
SCHWARTZ	SIMPSON	QUINLEY	COULOMBE	WASHBURN	ROBERTSON	SMITH	MONTROSS	K. SIMPSON			LAYNE	HOFFER	VANKOUGHNETT	SHOEMAKER
P	P	P	P	P	P	P	A	P			A	P	P	P

Notes:

Quorum Established: 11

Yes (X)

## 2. Pledge of Allegiance

## 3. Open Forum:

- a) Leon Schwartz – V.C City incorporation. Would like to see this happen.
- b) Susan Simpson – Presentation of 'Oliver' June 21, 22, 2008 at the Maxine Theater. Please attend.

## 4. Announcements & Items of Public Interest:

- a) Valley View Casino concert volume – Oliver Smith update: Michael Gorczynski, the GM of Valley View Casino at 291-5652
- b) Issue of the new church on Fruitvale Road – Oliver Smith: The Church is now meeting at Community Hall. They are pursuing the regular route of permits through the County to put a church on the property on Fruitvale.
- c) Valley View Casino expansion Draft Environmental Evaluation, June 17 comment period ends – Oliver Smith: Public comment meeting at the HR training room Tues. June 17, 2008 at 6:00 pm. The environmental evaluation for expansion of the non-smoking area of the Casino, an additional 6900 square feet. Comments should be addressed to: San Pasqual Casino Development Group, Inc. c/o Joe Navarro, 16300 Nyemii Pass Road, Valley Center, CA 92082. Mitigation for traffic and noise are included in the report.
- d) Chair to recommend Special Community Meeting regarding 3A Road/ Specific Planning Area Issue date, time & place to be voted on –Oliver Smith. Recommend a meeting at the Middle School Monday June 23, 2008 at 7:00 pm.
- e) Tim Kirkland of San Diego County Code Enforcement, to talk about how they address code conformance issues: Has a backlog of cases. Have added more staff. Give a series of citations. There is time between citations. They cover all sorts of violations: abandoned vehicle abatement, brush clearing, building, grading/storm water, graffiti, noise control, trailers, fire hazards, waste and zoning. Don't have the resources to sweep an area for all violations. There are too many different types of violations and it turns into a very negative situation in the neighborhood. Code Enforcement is reactive not proactive until there is a life or death issue.
- f) Trails update and possible vote on map revisions –Rich Rudolf: 15 new revisions. Including staging areas for horse trailers. These areas may be on private land in several instances. Valley Center Trails Association Request for Approval of "Staging Areas" for the County's Trails Master Plan Update Requested Actions:  
A. Accept this report;  
B. Approve the proposed "Staging Areas" shown on Exhibit 1 displayed at tonight's meeting

SUMMARY: On 1/14/08 and 3/10/08 you approved the VCTA's recommendations for changes to the County's Trails Master Plan. This report recommends the addition of "Staging Areas" for

equestrian rigs to park, to utilize the proposed trails:

1. Near Mirar de Valle and Frace Lane (Daley Ranch)
2. At the Southeast corner of the P & R District parcel (Lilac and Valley Center Roads)
3. Mc Mann Trust parcel (off Canyon Road south of water district pump station)
4. Aerie Park (Vaqueros, near Betsworth)
5. Lilac Ranch
6. Sundance Ranch
7. Segal Ranch (Southwest corner)
8. Bell Gardens
9. Near Angela Court and Yellow Brick Road
10. At or near VC/Pauma School District sites:
  - a. VC High School
  - b. VC Middle School
  - c. Lilac School
  - d. Martin Gang parking area south of Elementary schools' soccer/lacrosse field (Cole Grade/Fruitvale Roads).
11. Near West Lilac and Lancaster Mountain Road
12. Near Fire Station at Old 395 and Circle R Road

#### DISCUSSION:

Thank you again for Planning Group approval of VCTA recommendations for changes to the County Trails Master Plan at your January 14, 2008 and March 10, 2008 meetings. Maryanne Vancio of the County Parks and Recreation Department suggested the community might want to add staging areas. She advises other Planning Areas have already added Staging Areas to their Maps, and they are necessary to make the proposed trails/pathways function. The VCTA approved these additional changes at its 5/28/08 Special Meeting.

Most of the proposed sites are approximate, within a half mile of where marked on the map. Some, such as the Parks & Recreation District and Mc Mann Trust parcels, have already been agreed to, others, particularly the school district sites, still are in discussion/negotiation stages. All are subject to the Trails Master Plan principle of acquisition only from a willing donor or seller.

Staging Areas will provide ½-acre to 1-acre parking areas for equestrian rigs, large enough for several to park, and turn around to exit without having to back up. They will also provide trailhead parking for pedestrian hikers and mountain bicyclists to access the trails/pathways. Staging Areas would have signage to indicate the location and distances of adjacent trails, along with some other educational information.

#1 would provide access to Daley Ranch via either Frace Lane or Orchard View, and satisfy the City of Escondido's requirement for a parking area outside Daley Ranch.

#2 reflects the staging area proposed by the Valley center parks and Recreation District if they are able to develop the 9 ½-acre parcel at the VC/Lilac Roads intersection.

#3 reflects the offer by the McMann Family Trust (to complement the trail easement also promised along Keyes Creek in the canyon). There is a large flat area off Canyon Road just south of the water district's pump station.

#4 would provide access to future pathways along Betsworth Road and to Turner Lake.

#5 would use the proposed Lilac Ranch equestrian facilities to access the proposed public trails there, and south to the Keyes Creek Trail.

#6 proposes a Staging Area somewhere within the future Sundance Ranch Project, which would serve its trails, and support trails/pathways to the west on Rabbit Run and Miller Roads, to the east on Cool Valley/MacTan/Yellow Brick, Paso Robles/Fruitvale to the south, and Wilhite/Miller to the west.

#7 provides a second entry into the Keyes Creek Trail, connecting about midway between VC Road and Lilac Ranch.

#8 would service the high school area, and west to the proposed extension of Hilldale all the way to Lilac Ranch, and south and east to Cole Grade and Cool Valley, and enable a loop with Segal Ranch.

#9 would provide a trailhead into the Rincon Reservation to the east, and a loop to Sundance Ranch.

#10 The proposals are just at the beginning discussion stages with the school district. It would use existing parking areas for as many of the schools as possible, at times and areas to be negotiated with the district that would be compatible with joint school use. For example, County Parks and Recreation Department employees, or grant money, might be used to improve the parking area south of the elementary school soccer/lacrosse field (most recently used as the staging area for Western Days).

#11 would be a trailhead for the connection to the Fallbrook planning area via Lancaster Mountain down to the San Luis Rey River.

#12 would provide access to the Bonsal planning area trails and a loop for Lilac Ranch.

Please remember that it is necessary to have the areas on the Map to initiate discussions with willing donors or sellers from whom the Staging Areas would only be acquired, and that the county's trail easement indemnification ordinance will indemnify and hold harmless property owners from any damages arising out of recreational use on or adjacent to the staging area.

Smith: How many new mile of trails? A: None, this is for staging areas only.

Washburn: Does this force the land owners to sell/give their land if they want to build? A: No

Shoemaker: If you subdivide your property (discretionary permit), you must dedicate your land and build the trail to County standards.

Patsy Fritz – This can include building an oversize barn or guest house.

Rudolf: The only triggers are major/minor subdivisions and major use permits.

Coulombe: the property owners could be forced to build a trail? A: Not forced but asked.

Hofler: All of the property owners that are on or near the staging areas have been contacted? A: No

Rudolf: the County would contact the land owners after they are put on the map.

Stuart Lynch: Does not want horses on his property or along Running Creek Road

Patsy Fritz: Asks that McNally Road Trail be removed. It is a safety hazard. The road is windy and narrow and drops into the canyon on one side.

**Motion:** To endorse the staging areas that have been put forth by the V.C Trails Associations.

S C H W A R T Z	S. S I M P S O N	Q U I N L E Y	C O U L O M B E	W A S H B U R N	R O B E R T S O N	S M I T H	M O N T R O S S	K. S I M P S O N			L A Y N E	H O F L E R	V A N K O U G H N E T T	S H O E M A K E R
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y			A	N	N	Y
Maker/Second: Washburn/Quinley								Carries (Y – N – A): 9-2-0						

g)

GP Update Subcommittee report and vote on recommendation motions for Land Use Elements and proposed new 3A road development – Keith Simpson:

**General Plan Update Subcommittee Recommendations  
To the Valley Center Community Planning Group**

## Motions Regarding General Provisions of the GPU

### 1. Section: N/A

**Issue:** Due to time constraints imposed by the current GPU timeline, the GPU SC was not able to consider all input generated by members.

**Recommendation:** The VCCPG recognizes the work done by GPU members and recommends DPLU consider that input (included under: "GPU Community Input") as community work not reviewed or endorsed by the VCCPG.

### 2. Section: GPU general provisions

**Issue:** In January 2005 the VCCPG recommended the BOS reject the GPU without adequate equity mechanisms. Since that time, the VCCPG has consistently supported appropriate equity mechanisms in formal and informal actions. At this time, the BOS has not yet identified specific, viable equity mechanisms for the GPU.

**Recommendation:** The VCCPG reaffirms its ongoing recommendation the BOS incorporate appropriate equity mechanisms as a necessary part of the GPU.

### 3. Section: N/A

**Issue:** In August 2006 Supervisor Bill Horn added road segment known as 3.a to the VC circulation element. This road segment was not developed collaboratively with the PG and it does not comprise an east-west connection to the main areas of Valley Center. At its 5-12-2008 meeting, the VCCPG received a briefing from Messrs. Bob Citrano and Devon Muto of DPLU who advised the community that the BOS is considering changing the GPU maps to allow for significantly more population density in the vicinity of road segment 3.a. The population density will be added, ostensibly, to pay for road segment 3.a. After receiving this briefing, the VCCPG voted to oppose road segment 3.A and the associated development.

**Recommendation:** The VCCPG shall schedule a Special Meeting in order to receive updated information and consider action concerning road segment 3.A.

## Proposed Motion regarding the Land Use Element:

The VCCPG recommends DPLU incorporate the following input and changes into the GPU LUE:

### 1. Section: Entire document

**Issue:** There is too much conditional language in the LUE. DPLU needs to review document and replace "should," "may," "when appropriate," "encourage" and "support" with "shall," "require," and "must" and "enforce".

**Proposed Recommendation:** Replace conditional words such as: should, may, when appropriate, encourage, support, etc., with: shall, require, must, and enforce. Specific sections that must be changed include, but are not limited to:

1.B, 1.9, 1.10 – too subjective; language needs to be more specific

1.12, 2.2 – needs definition of "viability"

2.B, 2.2, 2.6, 2.7, 2.E, 2.19, 2.20 – needs definition of terms such as: sustainable, built natural environment, appropriate, consistent, and prominent. Also “conservation oriented” needs clear definition.

3.A – too vague; needs to define: well defined, detailed planning, appropriately sited.

LU 3.1, 3.3, 3.5 have too much conditional language

LU 5.1, 5.3, 5.4

**2. Section: Page LU 9, paragraph 2**

**Issue:** Additional language is needed to clarify any bonuses achieved are in return for extra amenities offered by developers that exceed normal mitigations.

**Recommendation:** Add language: “All development must provide amenities necessary to service the intensity it creates.”

**3. Section: Page LU – 13 Community Plans**

**Issue (1):** There is no specific language that contains urban services within the Village Boundary.

**Recommendation (2):** Add separate goal policies that clarify definition and purpose of Village Boundary. Definition must limit urban development and infrastructure such as cement sidewalks, street lights, and sewers to areas inside Village Boundaries. Policy should contain provisions that ensure Village Boundaries are incorporated as planning elements within individual Community Plans.

**Issue (2):** Language is too wordy and redundant.

**Recommendation (2):** Replace first three paragraphs with:

Because the unincorporated communities of San Diego County are so diverse, and the General Plan framework is purposefully flexible in order to accommodate this diversity – Community Plan texts and accompanying maps for each one of the twenty-six communities are crucial to the San Diego County General Plan.

Community Plans provide descriptions of each community’s character as well as detailed guidance for the unique implementation in each community of Land Use Principles, Frameworks and Designations, and Goals and Policies that are presented more generally in Countywide General Plan Elements. Community Plans contain the same elements as the General Plan -- in more detail specific to each community. These elements are: Land Use, Circulation, Housing, Conservation/Open Space, Safety and Noise. Community Plan Goals and Policies are more explicit and often more restrictive than those in the General Plan. Community Plans are adopted by the Board of Supervisors as part of the General Plan, and thus are consistent with its components and may only be amended as part of a General Plan Amendment.

Community Plans also delineate and define a Village Boundary. The Village Boundary contains the area planned for denser residential and more intense commercial and industrial development -- where urban services and amenities, such as civic facilities, sewers, municipal water, and streetlights, will be located. The Village Boundary may also delineate where different standards for roads, infrastructure improvements and other land

use or design controls, such as architectural standards and treatments for lighting, noise, signage and other particular design elements that apply.

**4. Section:** COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INFRASTRUCTURE page LU 14

**Issue:** Staging areas, pathways, and trails are not addressed as critical aspects to community planning.

**Recommendation:** The new (revised) first paragraph should include mention of Staging Areas, pathways and trails as important to community character, safety, and livability of the community.

**5. Section:** Page LU 21, fourth paragraph

**Issue:** Public facilities should be located in highly populated areas.

**Recommendation:** Add language to policy LU 3.6 that includes major public facilities such as schools, libraries, community centers, and parks.

**6. Section:** Policy LU 1.11 and LU 4.3—Semi-Rural and Rural Lands

**Issue:** There is no working definition for greenbelts that separate communities.

**Recommendation:** Develop specific policy to define greenbelts purpose, size, connectivity, uses, etc.

**7. Section:** LU – 1.2:

**Issue:** GPAs are developed without PG approval and community input.

**Recommendation:** Add language that will require PG approval of GPAs as a part of the regulatory process. GPAs should be permitted only if they are approved by voters, improve public health and safety, and if they improve road networks and other needed infrastructure.

**8. Section:** LU – 1.3:

**Issue:** In draft language, leapfrog development only applies to village densities, but it should also be applicable to semi-rural areas.

**Recommendation:** Add language that constrains leapfrog development of semi-rural densities located in rural lands.

**9. Section:** LU –1.4:

**Issue (1):** Current draft language limits new development if such development will cause reduced services to existing residents, but it doesn't limit new development if it will result in increased costs to existing residents.

**Recommendation (1):** Modify fourth bullet to read: "...without a reduction of services or an increase in costs to existing residents and businesses in the affected planning or sponsor area..." Exception: "unless approved by vote of impacted residents and businesses."

**Issue (2):** Draft language refers to a land use Category (as the abstract

concept/definition), but it should refer to specific geographic areas.

**Recommendation (2):** Change term “Village Regional Category” to “Village Boundary”

**10. Section:** LU – 1.10 and Non Residential Land Designations page LU 9

**Issue:** FAR provisions need to be included in community plans and zoning documents.

**Recommendation (1):** Remove specific FAR from the General Plan and include those provisions in associated Zoning Ordinances, Community Plans and Design Guidelines.

**Recommendation (2):** Change to: “Assign densities, minimum lot sizes and floor area ratios in a manner that is compatible with the character of each unincorporated community, and in accord with that Community’s Design Guidelines.”

**11. Section:** LU – 2.E; 2.19-20

**Issue:** The word “prominent” is nebulous and redundant (all ridgelines are prominent) and it allows too much room for interpretation.

**Recommendation:** Remove “prominent” from ridgeline goals and policies.

**12. Section:** LU – 3:

**Issue:** As discussed in the GPU SC 3-10-2008 recommendation #5 to the VCCPG, there are many constructive ideas mentioned in the Land Use Framework discussion (at the beginning of the LUE document) that are not supported with associated goals and policies. Example: there no policy to enforce the requirement of a detailed town center plan in place prior to development.

**Recommendation (1):** The DPLU must identify the specific ideas introduced (concerning community plans, Special Planning Areas, etc.) and develop specific goals and policies for those ideas.

**Recommendation (2):** Development that is not “in the pipeline” shall not occur until Community Plans, Special Study Areas, and Town Center planning is complete.

**13. Section:** Policy LU – 3.2

**Issue:** There’s a conflict between Policies LU 3.2 and Village Residential Designated text on page LU 8 regarding slope density adjustments in village areas. If there is no slope reduction in village areas, community character will be damaged.

**Recommendation:** Modify language on page LU 8 to conform with Policy 3.2.

**14. Section:** Policy LU – 3.3

**Issue:** Draft language doesn’t ensure Community Plans and Design Guidelines are legally binding documents and it does not provide adequate recourse for community residents, Planning and/or Sponsor Groups to oppose poor development.

**Recommendation:** Add language that states: “Community Plans and Design Guidelines are governing documents that control development. Such documents shall be developed and updated via a collaborative process with community residents, Planning and/or

Sponsor groups.”

**15. Section: 3.10**

**Issue:** Draft language removed provisions to require connectivity between developments.

**Recommendation:** DPLU should re-incorporate removed language to ensure connectivity between different developments.

**16. Section: Chapter 4-Context, third paragraph**

**Issue:** Environmental jargon isn’t comprehensible to most people.

**Recommendation:** Rewrite as follows: “One GP goal is to preserve contiguous blocks of habitat. This can be accomplished by implementing policies that require all development in Semi-Rural and Rural Lands protect and sustain ecosystems, topography, riparian corridors, rock formations, mature trees and other natural assets, and avoid natural hazards, such as flooding, steep slopes, and seismic instability.”

**17. Section: LU –5.1, 5.2, 5.5, 5.7**

**Issue:** Draft language does not provide requirements that development comply with Community Plans or Design Guidelines

**Recommendation:** Add “in accord with the Community Plan and Design Guidelines...” where indicated in these sections.

**18. Section: Policy LU—5.5**

**Issue:** Current language allows retail facilities that are too large for all communities.

**Recommendation:** Size of retail facilities must be specified/restricted in Community Plans.

**19. Section: LU – 6.A**

**Issue:** Many rural village areas attract large numbers of visitors and local residents, but there are not adequate policies to require additional public parking, restrooms, and other needed facilities that are required for special events and transit visitors.

**Recommendation:** Add policy to section: LU – 6.A that requires adequate public infrastructure for transit and community events.

**20. Section: Policy 6.3**

**Issue:** Communities need to ensure necessary road improvements are built in such a manner that protects community character and “sense of place.”

**Recommendation:** Add language: “The Community Plan shall contain standards for the design of roads and provision of emergency public services and facilities in villages and semi-rural and rural settings.”

**21. Section: Policy LU—1.13; LU—2.11**

**Issue:** Loose language concerning adverse impacts.



**Recommendation:** Change language to read: "... shall avoid adverse impacts to surrounding areas.

**Recommendation(1):** Add language: "...require incorporation of natural features including mature Oaks, indigenous trees, rock formations, and other natural features as defined in local Community Plans..."

**Recommendation (2):** Add language that prevents importation or spread of invasive flora.

**22. Section: Policy 6.5**

**Issue:** Language that connected availability of water resources to new development was removed from draft language.

**Recommendation:** Reinstate removed language to coordinate land use planning and development with water infrastructure planning to ensure sustainable, high quality water resources.

**23. Section: LU 2.6**

**Issue:** Conservation easements and open spaces need permanent funding sources established concurrently with adoption of such spaces to provide for ongoing maintenance, operations, and safety.

**Recommendation:** Incorporate language that ensures establishment of viable, permanent funding mechanisms concurrent with adoption of Conservation easements and open spaces.

**24. Section: Policy LU 1.14 – 1.15**

**Issue:** Number of DUs specified/allowed for housing developments is too large for small communities.

**Recommendation:** Add language that incorporates these mandates for smaller housing tracts as defined in local Community Plans.

**25. Section: Policy 6.23 – 6.24**

**Issue:** There is no reference to staging areas, pathways, trails.

**Recommendation:** Add appropriate cross references to the Trails Master Plan and Staging areas, pathways, trails.

**26. Section: Policy 2.6**

**Issue:** Conservation subdivision and open space protections are inadequate.

**Recommendation:** Change last sentence to read: "Projects that rely on lot size reductions shall achieve specific conservation objectives that are also desirable to the community, and they should incorporate specific site design techniques, perimeter lot sizes, and buffers in accord to achieve compatibility with local Community Plan."

## 27. Section: Policy

**Issue:** New developments sometimes block existing roads, trails, and emergency access ways.

**Recommendation:** Incorporate language to protect and enhance access.

Robertson: Would like to see action verbiage vs. conditional verbiage. Change any 'shoulds' to 'must' or 'require' or 'shall'.

Coulombe: Would like to include the exclusion of invasive exotic plants.

Stuart Lynch: Lilac Ranch has been trying to go through his property for years. 3a does not tie into Running Creek Road. It makes no sense.

Raquel Britsch/Hans Britsch: Comments to VC Planning Group

June 9, 2008

Raquel Britsch

Three weeks ago, my husband and I learned in a *newspaper* report that our home and farm would be destroyed by a new development, which is to include 3,000 new homes and a road that runs right through our greenhouses and within feet of our new home. You can imagine our shock, disbelief and disgust. In that same report, we also learned that this volunteer planning group *vehemently* voted to oppose that proposal and the method by which it has thus far been achieved. In so doing, the planning group not only stood up for the rights of VC residents to determine their own growth and way of life, but you also stood up for the individual property rights of those that would be directly affected by the proposal. You did this without ever having met us. My family is very cognizant of the fact that the volunteer members of this board spend countless hours of very valuable time, without compensation, to protect the rights of its citizens, and we want you to know that on behalf of myself, my husband Hans, sons Hansito, Nicolas and Marcos we are very thankful that you have stood up to a governmental action that is completely unjust to the VC community and to individual citizens like our family.

Property rights are a fundamental right that our forefathers fought to establish and protect in America. This right is as critical and important as our right to free speech – to express one's opinion, the right to due process of law – to receive notice and an opportunity to be heard, and the right to have a democratic government, which is for the people, and by the people. Our forefathers along with every man and woman who have fought in our military were willing to pay the ultimate price to protect these rights and our American way of life. This road, the taking of land to serve the needs of a developer, and inside dealings with our political officials all stand in opposition to what so many brave Americans have sought to protect.

In the last few weeks, we have met with attorneys and many others who have told us that "Hornsville" is just the way things get done in San Diego. They tell us that developers, the rich and connected all have inside connections with the politicians and that while we can stand in opposition, nothing will get done because deals have already been made. Well, this is not the America that I know and it's clearly not the America that this planning group is willing to stand for. When you voted to oppose "Hornsville" and as importantly, the method by which it is being accomplished, you sent a swift, courageous and strong statement that VC community will not stand for this anti-American, anti-Constitutional and anti-Citizen bulldozing of its community or of its citizens.

We, as a family, are committed to using every resource available to fight this encroachment of property, farm, home and our fundamental Constitutional rights. And as your neighbor, we are committed to supporting this communities' right to be heard *in a meaningful way* by its elected representatives. We sincerely thank you for having the courage and insight to swiftly and *vehemently* stand opposed to what can only be seen as a greedy Anti-American attempt to enforce the will of a developer and their political insider over the Valley Center Community and its individual citizens.

**Motion:** see above recommendations by the GPU Subcommittee

SCHWARTZ	SIMPSON	QUINLEY	COULOMBE	WASHBURN	ROBERTSON	SMITH	MONTROSS	KSIMPSON			LAYNE	HOFER	VANKOUGHNETT	SHOEMAKER
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y			A	Y	Y	Y
Maker/Second: K. Simpson/ Robertson								Carries/Fails (Y-N-A): 11 - 0 - 0						
5.		Approval of Minutes:												
Motion: none														
Notes: The May 12, 2008 Minutes were not disseminated.														
6.		Land Use Items:												
6.a.		TPM 21103, (Montross) continued												
Discussion & Comments: Spearhead Trail 11.6 acres into 2 parcels. Owner McBride;														
6.b.		TPM 21123, (Quinley)												
Discussion & Comments: Paradise Mountain Road, lot split, 5+ acres into two lots. Nothing will change, the existing driveway is to be used. Neighbors are OK with it and it fits with the size lots of the neighborhood.														
Motion: to approve pursuant the scoping letter.														
SCHWARTZ	SIMPSON	QUINLEY	COULOMBE	WASHBURN	ROBERTSON	SMITH	MONTROSS	KSIMPSON			LAYNE	HOFER	VANKOUGHNETT	SHOEMAKER
AB	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	A			A	Y	Y	Y
Maker/Second: Quinley/Robertson								Carries: 9-0-0						
Notes:														
6.c.		TPM 21126 (Quinley)												
Discussion & Comments: 12542 Betsworth road. 8+ acres into 3 lots. Owner, Harlow Family Trust Neighbors are OK with this. This fits with the neighborhood.														
Motion: Recommend approval of the lot split pursuant the scoping letter.														
SCHWARTZ	SIMPSON	QUINLEY	COULOMBE	WASHBURN	ROBERTSON	SMITH	MONTROSS	KSIMPSON			LAYNE	HOFER	VANKOUGHNETT	SHOEMAKER
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	A			A	Y	Y	Y
Maker/Second: Quinley/Schwartz								Carries (Y-N-A): 10-0-0						
Notes:														
6.d.		P03-102 (Robertson)												
Discussion & Comments: 26945 Valley Center Road. Sprint/Nextel. This is next to the T-mobile tower. Cannot add to the existing tower. Would like to build a 'faux' tree that conforms to the existing zoning code. There is only one close neighbor - he is OK with it. Hofer - we previously voted on this when it was with ATT&T. We approved but required the existing landscaping be maintained to screen the tower.														
Motion: To approve as presented, subject to the maintenance of the existing landscaping that screens the tower. If it were removed, then the proponent to replace with equivalent landscaping.														
S	S	Q	C	W	R	S	M	K			L	H	V	S

CHWARTZ	SIMPSON	QUINLEY	COULOMBE	ASHBURN	ROBERTSON	MITCH	ONTROSS	SIMPSON			AYNE	HOFLER	ANKOUGHNETT	SHOEMAKER
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	A			A	Y	Y	Y
Maker/Second: Robertson/Hofler								Carries (Y-N-A): 10-0-0						
Notes:														
6.e.		TPM 20811RRLS (Washburn) no action												
<b>Discussion &amp; Comments:</b> Red Hawk Road, 9 acres into 4 lots, Owner Mustafa														
6.f.		P08-016 (Layne) continued												
<b>Discussion &amp; Comments:</b> Bottle Creek, Verizon Wireless, Replacement map														
7.		<b>Announcements &amp; Items of Interest to the VCCPG:</b>												
a)		New chair for Lilac Ranch is requested. Ann Quinley volunteered and will take over for Frank Shoemaker.												
8.		<b>Subcommittee Reports &amp; Business:</b>												
a)		Brook Forest – open, Chair.												
b)		Circulation – John Coulombe, Chair.												
c)		GP Update – Keith Simpson, Chair.												
d)		Nominations – Leon Schwartz, Chair.												
e)		Orchard Run – Deb Hofler, Chair. Amendment – scoping letter.												
f)		Paradise Mountain – open, Chair.												
g)		Rancho Lilac – Frank Shoemaker, Chair.												
h)		Rules Revision – Keith Simpson, Chair.												
i)		Northern Village – Deb Hofler, Chair. Let sue Simpson know												
j)		Strategic Planning—Keith Simpson, Chair.												
k)		Southern Node —Terry Van Koughnett, Chair.												
l)		Tribal Liaison – Terry Van Koughnett, Chair.												
m)		Valley Center Church – Terry Van Koughnett, Chair. Presented the latest sit plans and landscaping plans. There are three phases. Only phase one is presented. This is 23,000 square feet between three buildings. This should serve our needs for the next 10 – 15 years. There is a dedication of a road easement along the western edge of the property. The highest point is 57 feet above grade. The sanctuary parfait is 41 feet above grade. The total building space after build out is approximately 50,000 square feet.												
n)		Website – Terry Van Koughnett, Chair.												
9.		<b>Correspondence Received:</b>												
a.		SPA 08-001 & TM5087RPL Orchard Run (Hofler)												
b.		SDCPC prelim Agenda May 16, 2008												
c.		BOS Agenda May 13 & 14, 2008												
d.		SDCPC prelim Agenda May 30, 2008												
e.		Valley View Non-Smoking Casino Expansion Project												
f.		TPM21113 Turner Minor Subdiv. 29133 Sandy Hill Rd. owner Benoff (S. Simpson)												
g.		TPM 21105 RPL Robinson Estates Replacement Map												
h.		GPA 06-013, SPA 06-007 etc. Castle Creek Condominiums (K. Simpson)												
i.		SDCPC prelim Agenda June 13, 2008												
10.		<b>Requests for Items on Upcoming Agendas:</b>												
a)		TPM 21113, (S. Simpson) 29133 Sandy Hill Rd, owner Benoff												
b)		P08-007, (Montross) Double Canyon Cell Tower												
c)		S08-005, (Schwartz) Valley Center Towing S. Cole Grade Rd.												
d)		TPM 21074, (Coulombe) Little Quail Run , to Circulation Sub Committee												

11.	<b>Motion to Adjourn:</b>	
	Maker/Second:	Vote:
Notes: adjourned by default at 10 p.m.		